

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 have been canceled, claims 7 and 11 have been amended and new claims 15-23 have been added. No claims have been canceled by way of this response. Thus, claims 7-23 are currently pending and presented for examination. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Response to Rejections Under Section 102:

Claims 7-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(e), the Examiner contending that these claims are anticipated by Hall et al. (US 20030208493).

In order to reject the claims it must be demonstrated that every feature presented in the claims can be found in the prior art. With respect to the claims as examined, it is submitted that there is neither anticipation nor obviousness of applicants' claimed subject matter. However, the independent claims have each been amended.

Applicants' Claim 7 recites:

*providing a source file described in an extensible markup language;
structuring the data in the source file in the form of objects,
wherein components of the objects are stored in first files, wherein
the components each represent a logical unit of an object;*

In contrast, Hall teaches providing object design metadata (so it is not an object itself) to be transferred using a standardized XML markup (see e.g. paragraph 0223). Thus a data transmission for special data (object design metadata) is disclosed by Hall et al. Hall et al. does not disclose or suggest that data is stored in a file using a extensible markup language, wherein in addition the data is stored using objects, and wherein components of the objects are stored in a first file.

Furthermore Applicants' Claim 7 recites:

*providing the reading-in tool, wherein the reading-in tool
passes over or avoids reading or processing portions of the source
file data when seeking other portions of the source file data for use
in the application.*

The Examiner contends that Hall et al. teaches in paragraphs 0032-0033 and 0053-0055 the use of a reading-in tool, said reading-in tool passing over or avoiding having to read or process portions of the source file. The Office Action merely states that this limitation corresponds in some unspecified way to 5 lengthy paragraphs. However, the Office Action does not indicate which of the host of things discussed in these portions correspond to the reading-in tool and how the reading-in tool performs. The pertinence must be explained (37 C.F.R. § 1.104(c)(2)). The Office Action simply points to the paragraphs describing a multitude of elements, without indicating which are thought pertinent, or how. Therefore the Applicants respectfully requests that the Examiner identify what the Examiner considers the reading-in tool and how the reading in tool performs.

Applicants' Claim 11 recites:

a parser

The reference Hall et al. does not disclose or suggest a parser. MPEP 2173.06 states:

All words in a claim must be considered in judging the
patentability of a claim against the prior art.

In view of the above, claims 7 and 11 are not anticipated by Hall et al. Furthermore, Claims 8-10 and 15-23 which depend on claim 7 are also patentable at least based on their dependence from claim 7 as well as based on their own merits. Furthermore, Claims 12-14 which depend on claim 11 are also patentable at least based on their dependence from claim 11 as well as based on their own merits. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the Section 102 rejections.

New Claims:

New claims 15-23 further define the scope of the invention as described in the specification and drawings. In view of the foregoing remarks regarding the other claims, Applicants respectfully submit new claims 15-23 are patentable at least based on their dependency from the respective independent claim as well as based on their own merits.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the objections and rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the objections and rejections and timely pass the application to allowance. Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this paper. The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including fees for additional claims and terminal disclaimer fee, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 28, 2008

By: Daniel J. Ryan
Daniel J. Ryan
Registration No. 61,232
(407) 736-6096

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830